

Isn't it the right time for librarians to officially join clinical trial teams?

Farhad Shokraneh

Information Specialist, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham

Symonds and Budge¹ are raising a classic but important and neglected concern on how a proper systematic review could prevent waste in trials and add value to the research.^{2,3} A living systematic review is required alongside each clinical trial. This review should start with the raising of a clinical question and continue to be updated during the protocol/grant application writing, and designing, conducting, recording, and reporting the trial to safeguard every research project from reinventing the wheel or worse a flat tire.⁴

While the involvement of librarians and information specialists could avoid the similar waste caused by missing literature,⁵ research teams constantly resist involving a search expert in their team. Clinical trials require daily, weekly and monthly updates from the literature which could be achieved through designing, running, and updating the rigor search strategies in bibliographic databases.

Librarians and information specialists are equipped with the information skills to avoid preventable waste in research. Furthermore, their efforts on systematic reviewing for ongoing trials could result in added value such as a secondary updateable and shareable bibliographic database of literature per clinical question for the research team and audiences who could use it in writing the report or updating the literature review in a faster and more accurate way.

Competing Interests

No competing interests.

Citation

Shokraneh, Farhad. Isn't it the right time for librarians to officially join clinical trial teams? BMJ. Available at: <https://www.bmj.com/content/362/bmj.k4007/rr> [Published: 18 October 2018] DOI 10.13140/RG.2.2.24420.01922

References

1. Symonds ME, Budge H. Comprehensive literature search for animal studies may have saved STRIDER trial. BMJ 2018; 362: k4007. DOI 10.1136/bmj.k4007
2. Chalmers I, Glasziou P. Avoidable waste in the production and reporting of research evidence. Lancet 2009; 374 (9683): 86-9. DOI 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60329-9
3. Glasziou P, Chalmers I. How systematic reviews can reduce waste in research. 2015. <https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2015/10/29/how-systematic-reviews-can-reduce-waste-in-research/> [Published 29 October 2015]
4. Booth A, Sutton A, Papaioannou D. Systematic Approaches to a Successful Literature Review. 2nd ed. Sage Publications; 2016.
5. Kirtley S. Increasing value and reducing waste in biomedical research: librarians are listening and are part of the answer. Lancet 2016; 387(10028): 1601. DOI 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30241-0